


Clinical and Experimental
RHEUMATOLOGY

Via Santa Maria 31, 56126 Pisa, Italy



FAX MESSAGE

To: Mrs. L. van Grieken-Plooster

Fax: +31-33-4227319

From: Clin. Exp. Rheumatology

Fax: +39-050-502299


Date: January 27, 2003

RECEIVED
JAN 30 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Dear Mrs. Van Grieken-Plooster,

I herewith state that the article named "Recombinant human erythropoietin (r-hu-EPO) treatment in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and anaemia chronic disease (ACD)" by the authors A.J. Swaak, C. Nieuwenhuizen and G. Vreugdenhil was delivered to us by our printer, ready to be mailed to our subscribers, on October 31, 1994.

Sincerely yours,


Luisa Marconcini
Managing Editor

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/817,704

Applicant
Swaak

Examiner
F. Pierre VanderVegt

Group Art Unit
1644

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) F. Pierre VanderVegt

(3) Johan Renes

(2) Robert Carpenter

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 28, 2001

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 14, 18, 20, and 30

Identification of prior art discussed:
GB 2 171 304 A of record

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Applicant discussed differences between the length of treatment in the reference versus the length of treatment in the instant invention. Applicant pointed out that the art treatment was only one week while the instant treatment was 3 to 6 weeks, which allowed the results seen in the instant specification. Applicant is considering amendment of the time period in the claims to recite --3 to 6-- weeks. Examiner agreed that there was support for this language in the claims and Applicant agreed to point out this support when the amendment is submitted. The Examiner agreed that these showing would address at least some of the outstanding issues.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



RECEIVED
JAN 30 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

[Signature]